

543  
DI  
C1

detecting reception of the received a signal from the remote transmitter at the mobile phone,  
inspecting said received signal for determining its quality, at least in terms of a percentage of acceptable,  
providing an output correlated to the results of said inspecting step, and  
providing a user discernible indication in response to said output provided during said operation of providing the output, the user discernible indication indicative of the quality of the received signal in terms of the percentage of acceptable.

---

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Legree during the aforementioned January 13<sup>th</sup> telephonic conference. Applicant has carefully considered the application in view of the Examiner's action and the January 13<sup>th</sup> telephonic conference and, in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Claim 1 has been objected because of certain informalities. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to overcome the objections to Claim 1, without adding any new matter to the application as originally filed. In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objections to Claim 1.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,381,451 to Parisel et al. (hereinafter "Parisel") in view U.S. Patent No. 6,219,540 to Besharat et al. (hereinafter "Besharat") and U.S. Patent No. 6,445,916 to Rahman (hereinafter "Rahman"). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parisel in view of Besharat and in view of Rahman as applied to Claim 6, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,039 to Obayashi et al. (hereinafter "Obayashi"). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parisel in view Besharat, in view of Rahman as applied to Claim 8, and in view of Obayashi. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parisel in view of Besharat and in view of Rahman as applied to Claim 10 (per clarification rendered during the aforementioned telephonic